

Remarks & Arguments

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that Claims 1-30 are pending in the application, and that Claims 1-30 are rejected. By this amendment, Claim 15 has been amended. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-4, 6-14 and 23-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0210275 to Draschwandtner.

With regard to **Claims 1 and 6**, the Office refers to Draschwandtner at par. 0034-0035, to support the assertion that Draschwandtner teaches "a script graphical user interface module ... for parsing information received from execution of said script." The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office's position, and suggest that the relied upon passages do not support the Office's assertion. Instead, Draschwandtner clearly only discloses receiving information "selected by the developer" and information from "the data structure 18" contained in the "interface module 10" that is separate from the "CLI application 12." Draschwandtner does not disclose receiving any **information from the executing script** that is parsed to "determine an input type command and [generate] an appropriate graphical input mechanism for said command line interface as a function of said input type command." Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 6 are patentable over Draschwandtner. Accordingly, Applicants

request that the anticipation rejection of Claims 1 and 6 be withdrawn and that Claims 1 and 6 be allowed.

Claims 2-4 and 7-14 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on respective base Claims 1 and 6 respectively, as well as the additional elements they recite. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the anticipation rejection of Claims 2-4 and 7-14 be withdrawn and that Claims 2-4 and 7-14 be allowed.

With regard to **Claim 23**, the Office refers to Draschwandtner at par. 0034-0035, to support the assertion that Draschwandtner teaches “receiving information from a script having a command line interface.” The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office’s position, and suggest that the relied upon passages do not support the Office’s assertion. Instead, Draschwandtner clearly only discloses receiving information “selected by the developer” and information from “the data structure 18” contained in the “interface module 10” that is separate from the “CLI application 12.” Draschwandtner does not disclose receiving any **information from the executing script** that is parsed to “determine if said information comprises a tag” and “generating a first graphical user interface corresponding to said command line interface comprising an input prompt when said information comprises a tag.” Furthermore, Applicants note that the tag in Draschwandtner refers to tags contained in a command that are determined from “data structure 18” and not from information received from the executing script.” Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claim 23 is patentable over Draschwandtner. Accordingly, Applicants request that the anticipation rejection of Claim 23 be withdrawn and that Claim 23 be allowed.

Claims 24-28 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on respective base Claim 23, as well as the additional elements they recite. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the anticipation rejection of Claims 24-28 be withdrawn and that Claims 24-28 be allowed.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 5, 15-19, 22, 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious in view of the combination of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0210275 to Draschwandtner and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0163090 to Ledru.

With regard to **Claim 5**, the Office refers to Draschwandtner at par. 0034-0035, to support the assertion that Draschwandtner teaches “a script graphical user interface module ... for parsing information received from execution of said script.” The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office’s position, and suggest that the relied upon passages do not support the Office’s assertion. Instead, Draschwandtner clearly only teaches receiving information “selected by the developer” and information from “the data structure 18” contained in the “interface module 10” that is separate from the “CLI application 12.” Draschwandtner does not disclose receiving any **information from the executing script** that is parsed to “determine an input type command and [generate] an appropriate graphical input mechanism for said command line interface as a function of said input type command.”

Ledru is cited as teaching “a client comprising a Web browser ... and a command line interface (CLI) having a user interface program in which a user responds to a visual prompt by

typing a command and receiving responses...” and “a Web page repository having a collection of pages such as Java server ... pages for generating an output similar to a static HTML page ...”

Thus, Ledru also does not teach or suggest “a script graphical user interface module ... for parsing information received from execution of said script” nor “[determining] an input type command and generating an appropriate graphical input mechanism for said command line interface as a function of said input type command.”

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claim 5 is patentable over Draschwandtner, Ledru and the combination thereof. Accordingly, Applicants request that the obviousness rejection of Claim 5 be withdrawn and that Claim 5 be allowed.

Claim 15, as amended recites “a script graphical user interface module, communicatively coupled to said script, for parsing information received from execution of said script to determine an input type command and generating a first Java server page comprising a prompt corresponding to said input type command.” In contrast, Draschwandtner clearly only teaches receiving information “selected by the developer” and information from “the data structure 18” contained in the “interface module 10” that is separate from the “CLI application 12.” Thus, Draschwandtner does not disclose receiving any **information from the executing script** that is parsed to “to determine an input type command and generating a first Java server page comprising a prompt corresponding to said input type command.”

Ledru is cited as teaching “a client comprising a Web browser ... and a command line interface (CLI) having a user interface program in which a user responds to a visual prompt by typing a command and receiving responses...” and “a Web page repository having a collection of

pages such as Java server ... pages for generating an output similar to a static HTML page ...”

Thus, Ledru also does not teach or suggest “a script graphical user interface module ... for parsing information received from execution of said script” nor “[determining] an input type command and generating an appropriate graphical input mechanism for said command line interface as a function of said input type command.”

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claim 15 as amended is patentable over Draschwandtner, Ledru and the combination thereof. Accordingly, Applicants request that the obviousness rejection of Claim 15 be withdrawn and that Claim 15 be allowed. In addition, **Claims 16-19 and 22** are allowable by virtue of their dependency on respective base Claim 15, as well as the additional elements they recite. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness rejection of Claims 16-19 and 22 be withdrawn and that Claims 16-19 and 22 be allowed.

With regard to Claims 29 and 30, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable by virtue of the dependency on respective base Claim 23, as well as the additional elements they recite, for the same reasons as advanced with regard to Claims 23 and 15.

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious in view of the combination of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0210275 to Draschwandtner, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0163090 to Ledru and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0070968 to Austin. For each of the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 15 is patentable over Draschwandtner and Ledru. Austin is cited as teaching “a module for determining if a user has authorization to invoke the

script for execution and denying access to the script if the user does not have said authorization.” Thus, Austin does not add anything to the teachings of Draschwandtner or Ledru with reference to Claim 15. In particular, neither Austin, Draschwandtner nor Ledru teach or suggest “a script graphical user interface module, communicatively coupled to said script, for parsing information received from execution of said script to determine an input type command and generating a first Java server page comprising a prompt corresponding to said input type command.” Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claim 20 is patentable over Draschwandtner and Ledru in view of Austin based upon its dependency on respective independent Claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants request that the obviousness rejection of Claim 20 be withdrawn and that Claim 20 be allowed.

Conclusion

For all the reasons advanced above, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and that action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants’ undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required for this amendment, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 504160. In the event that an extension of time is required, or may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that

Appl. No. 10/631,339
Amdt. Dated 3/7/08
Reply to Office Action of 11/7/07

extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account 504160.

Respectfully submitted,
MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 3/7/08



Eric J. Gash
Registration No. 46,274
Tel.: (408) 938-9080 ext. 127